

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's Interview Summary correctly restates the Examiner's position regarding her analysis of amended claim 1 in a telephone call to the undersigned.

Form PTOL-413, Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments, prepared by the Examiner states:

Mr. Tejawani faxed the Examiner a draft/unofficial copy of the proposed amendments after final on 5-4-04 and an associate power of atty. on 5-11-04, Mr. Tejawani requested a telephonic interview in order to discuss the proposed amendments and remarks after final. On 5-11-04 after receiving the associate power of atty., the examiner contacted Mr. Tejawani and discussed claim 1 and indicated that although the response and proposed amendments seemed to address and would remove the 112 rejections made in the final office action, the prior art (Sasaki, US 4,066,546.) used to reject the claims, has not been overcome. The proposed claim 1 would still be rejected using the same prior art because the language of claim 1 is still broad and specifically, the filter arrangement being claimed is open to the interpretation of having one filter medium layer, and that one filter medium layer is connected to the body/plate by sintering as disclosed by Sasaki (546) in col. 3, lines 19 - 24. No agreement with regards to the patentability of the claims have been reached. At this time, no official response to the final office action has been submitted. A copy of the draft/unofficial response has been attached to this communication.

While these statements accurately summarize Examiner Ocampo's narration of her position on claim 1, the undersigned respectfully submits that the Interview Summary should further record that Examiner Ocampo did not grant the undersigned's request for a discussion of the Remarks/arguments accompanying the amended claims in the Draft Reply or applicants' position on the prior art. The undersigned understood Examiner Ocampo as saying that she would not grant an interview but only state her position on the Draft Reply. Accordingly, undersigned did not present any arguments during the telephone discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 11, 2004



Manu J. Teiwani  
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,952  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-4498

Attorney for Applicant  
(212) 408-2614